A

DEFENCE

OF

Dr. *SHERLOCK*'s Preservative

AGAINST

POPERY,

IN

REPLY

TO A

Jesuit's Answer:

Wherein the R. Father's Reasonings are fully Confuted.

By *William Giles* a Protestant Footman, living with Madam *H.* in *Mark-Lane.*

The Second Edition.

London, Printed for *B. Aylmer*, at the *Three Pigeons* over against the *Royal Exchange* in *Cornhil*, 1688.

DEFENCE

OF

DR. SHERLOCK'S Preservative

AGAINST

POPERY

IN

REPLY

TO

Jesuits Answer:

Wherein the R. Father's Cheatings

are fully Confuted.

THE PUBLISHER TO THE READER.

I Have heard it often observed, that it would be a Work worth any ingenious Man's pains, and very acceptable to the World, to take a View of the whole Controversie betwixt the Writers of the Church of Rome *and us since his Majesties coming to the Crown; and to compare it with the Management of this same Controversie at the beginning of the Reformation, and through the late Reigns, I am assured it would make such a Discovery of the present Controvertists of that Church, as would make all them to blush that have any Modesty, and the World to blush for them that have none.*

It is very well known, that when the Reformation began, Learning was at a very Low Ebb, and they of the Church of Rome, *who were commanded to defend it against the Reformers, had a very hard Task of it, since they were engaged in matters wholly new to them; and, which was worse, in the Defence of a Cause which did want Arguments ten thousand times better than any could be gotten for it. However, to their Credit be it spoken, they undertook the matter fairly, and were so just to their Adversaries, as well*

in

as to their own Cauſe, as to anſwer Book with Book, and not to drop their Weapon, and run away after the firſt little Charge.

But we have a quite contrary ſort of Men to deal with now-a-days; they write as if the Controverſie had but juſt begun, and as if they had not read ſo much as their own old Authors; but after one little Effort, fall to Sheet and Half-ſheet Replies, as if they that furniſhed them with the firſt Book, could not have furniſhed them alſo with a Fair Reply. It is a very broad Sign that ſome Men came very unprepared to this Controverſie, and that it was a perfect Surprize to them, who dreamt ſurely of nothing leſs than of ſending and proving, they have been ſo untoward at it.

And this is that which hath made this preſent Controverſie ſo very miſchievous unto them; for ſome of their own Laity could not but own that the anſwering of large Books by Sheet, or a Half-ſheet, did not appear fair, but that it was very like it, if not a direct betraying of their Cauſe: And this was too apt to raiſe Suſpicions, either that their Prieſts could not defend their Cauſe, or that their Cauſe was ſuch as was not to be defended. It were eaſie to give the Reader many Inſtances of this Kind: When the Six Conferences concerning the Euchariſt *were publiſhed, a Book written with ſo much ſtrength of Reaſon and Solidity, and which bore ſo very hard upon their great Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, as to undertake to demonſtrate that it did overthrow the Proofs of Chriſtian Religion; we might have expected that the* Romiſh Prieſts *would have been juſtly alarm'd at ſuch a Book of ſo threatning a Nature to their Darling Tranſubſtantiation, and would have employed the beſt Heads among them to anſwer ſo dangerous a Book; but as if they had all been aſleep, the World is preſented with a drowſie Half-ſheet at laſt againſt a Book of about eighteen Sheets; as if Yawning were to paſs for Anſwering.*

When

To the Reader.

When that excellent Book, The Second Defence of the Expoſition againſt the Biſhop of *Meaux* and his Vindicator *was Printed, and did ſo largely and ſo effectually prove all the former Charges againſt the wretched prevarications of that Biſhop, and his Vindicator; Was it not a very pleaſant thing to ſee a Sheet and a half Printed againſt it, with the pompous Title, of a full Anſwer to it? But I cannot be angry at the Man, for all the World is ſatisfied that he is ſick of that Controverſie; and that a Sheet and a half was enough in Conſcience for a man in his Condition. He did indeed about the ſame time threaten the learned* Author *of the* Diſcourſe againſt Extreme Unction, *with a Sheet againſt his Book; wherein he would take it to pieces: But I ſuppoſe he was half aſleep when he made that promiſe, and quite forgot it upon his firſt ſleep. It is ten to one, but ſome of their party will rouſe up this doughty Champion, and tell him, that now he may venture to write his Sheet againſt that Book, ſince there is no fear of an Anſwer from the* Author *of that* Diſcourſe, *who is now in his Grave: but if I might be of Councel to him, I would adviſe him to think twice before he ventures on his Sheet-Anſwer; for though the* Incomparable *and* never-to-be-forgotten *Dr.* Clagett, *the* Author *of that* Book *be (to our unſpeakable loſs) in his Grave, yet neither his* Book, *nor his* Memory, *nor his* Friends *are buried with* him; *and though that Book is more than able to defend it ſelf againſt ſo very weak an Adverſary, yet were it not, I am told, that let our Adverſaries begin as ſoon as they pleaſe, either againſt that or any other of his many* excellent Diſcourſes *againſt* Popery; *they will find, that there are too many* Friends to the Memory and Reputation *of that* Pious *and* Learned Champion *of the* Church of England, *to ſuffer any thing againſt* Him *to lye unanſwered: And I cannot fancy but ſome People are my humble Servants for this kind hint, who do not love to burn their Fingers.*

I will but mention one other instance of our Adversaries extravagant behaviour in this kind, against that Book, *the* Defence *of which I am intrusted to publish*, *the* celebrated PRESERVATIVE AGAINST POPERY: *how very acceptable to the World this* excellent Tract *was, the universal entertainment it met with, and the many thousands of it so greedily bought up, do sufficiently shew; how much the* Book *did in it self deserve all that kindness it found, every* Reader *will soon discover, that will but give himself the trouble to read any one page of it. I must confess, I have been mightily pleased, that our Adversaries themselves can find how very good a Book it is. I hear some of them rail unmeasurably at it, and are at a loss sometimes how to vent themselves more passionately against it: and this I take for as infallible a sign, that this Book is a very good one, as I would the least commendation of theirs, for its being a very dull one.*

This Book then, which the Commendations of all our own Church, and the bitter Revilings of some of our Adversaries have made so conspicuous, and attested its great worth, did deserve a very skilful Manager (if they must be answering it) to pull down all the worthy Doctor *had with so much Skill and Accuracy been building against them; did call for one who could answer with the same Solidity, Clearness and Wit that the* Doctors Book *had been written with. But as if this* Book *had been one of the dullest pieces that was published on our part, a* Jesuit, *(that is famous for something) is employ'd to answer it; and as if there had been no reason, nor sense, nor any thing for an Adversary to fasten upon in the* PRESERVATIVE, *the* Jesuit *gives us* an Answer *of a Sheet, as thinking that enough, or too much to employ against a* Book *that had nothing in it.*

But this Jesuit *is one of the most unlucky* men *that ever ventur'd upon* Controversie; *for as all the world did grant*

that

that this was a ridiculous Answer to so Great a Book, so it raised the Indignation of most Men against it, to see a Jesuit *trifling in a matter of so great concern, and nibling at a Book, the least Paragraph of which he is utterly unable to Answer. This is that, I believe, which provoked the* honest Footman *to Write this* Reply *to the* Jesuites Answer *to the* Doctors PRESERVATIVE; *for* he *found the* Jesuit *had Written in such a strain of Sense and Reason together, as if he had intended to enter the lists with some such Person as himself, and not with the* Excellent Master of the Temple: *and I do not wonder that the* honest Footman *could not resist the Temptation of catching the* Jesuit *at such an advantage, and of taking this so favourable an Opportunity of having a certain Victory over him; this would have tempted a more Learned Man, but I am well enough pleased that the honest* young Footman *has the glory of it.*

One would have expected that when the Jesuit *undertook to Answer so large a* Book *as the* Preservative *in so little room, he would have fallen immediately upon the Book he was Answering: but he it seems thought he had room to call others to account too in that small compass; and does very severely fall upon all our* Reformers *in general, as well as* some Authors *alive in particular.*

The Honest Footman *does confine himself in his* Reply *to the* Defence *of the* PRESERVATIVE *it self, and lets the* Jesuites Preface *alone, as nothing to the purpose indeed there: but I am willing to have a word or two with him about it, and see how the* Reformers *and those Men are concerned here in an Answer to Dr.* SHERLOCKS PRESERVATIVE.

The Jesuit at first dash accuses our Reformers of falling presently [*when they set up for opposers of* Popery] to forgeries, cliping of Texts, Fathers and Councils:

but forgets in his fury to give the Reader one instance of any Forgery, *or* cliping *of* Text, Father *or* Council. *He should not have forgotten to have done this, since the World will be ready enough to believe that it was not for any good will that he did omit them, but that all the reason was, that though he had malice enough to accuse them of it, yet that he wanted means to prove it upon them. But this accusation they find to be absolutely necessary, because our Men do so often accuse them of those very things, and they are not for being behind-hand in such charges, true or false it makes no matter, the thing must be done to keep off some way or other so severe a blow. The Accusations run high on both sides, and the Reader hath this certain way of knowing where the guilt lyes; that the* Church of Rome *accuse us, but do not prove it, but our Men do not only accuse them, but prove it upon them.*

For a clear Proof of this we need look no further than this Jesuit *himself, who of all Men living should have kept his Pen from such an Accusation, since he knows one that lyes under the severe charge of many such things. This very* Jesuit *is the Person so famous for the Controversie about a* Sermon *of St.* Austins *betwixt* him *and One of our learned* Writers, *who did not only prove that that* Sermon *which the* Jesuit *had quoted in a Prayer before* Sermon *was a Forgery, but that the Authors he brought afterwards to defend himself with, were neither better nor worse than down-right Forgeries; I have given my self the trouble for the worlds sake of examining that* Controversie, *and find that the* 14*th* Sermon de Sanctis *urged by the Jesuit is a* Forgery; *that the* 18*th of the same sort is a Forgery, that his* S. Hieroms Sermon * *was a Forgery, that his* Hephonsus *was a Forgery, that his* Mallion's Sermon *was a Forgery, that his* Story *about* Juvenal *and* Marcian *the* Emperour *was a Forgery.*

* *See the First and Second Letters to* Lewis Sabran *Jesuit.*

And

And in a Controverſie betwixt theſe two, not above a month ago, about Invocation of Saints, *I find our* Author *charging the* Jeſuit *with the ſame things or worſe,* * *that his* firſt Author *was ſuppoſititious*; *that* he *had not only clipt* that Authors words, *but brought them in to prove that very thing, for the confuting of which the* Author *had* himſelf *intended them: that he had put down a* Prayer *to the* Virgin Mary, *as out of that Author, not a ſyllable of which was to be found there*; *that the* Jeſuit *had falſified his next quotation from S.* Cyril; *that his* Nectarius upon Theodore *was a Forgery*; *that his* Prayers *to the* Virgin Mary *from* Methodius, *from* Ephrem Syrus, *from* Athanaſius *and from* Leo *were Forgeries*; *that* Gregory Nazianzens *Prayer to* her *was a Forgery*; *that* his Proofs *from S.* Ambroſe, *from* Gregory Nazianzens Iambicks *were Forgeries*; *that his Proof from the* Council *of Chalcedon was clipt and abuſed*; *that his* Quotations *from the* Council *of* Laodicea, Gangræ *and* Carthage *were every one of them miſrepreſented, and abuſed*; *I muſt confeſs I was amazed at ſuch a* maſs *of* Forgeries *in ſo little room, and could not have thought it poſſible that any Man that pretends to the leaſt knowledge in Books could be guilty of ſuch things, much leſs that this very* Jeſuit *could have been the Man, who is ſo very ready to accuſe others (though moſt falſely) of it.*

* *See the Third Letter to Sabran the Jeſuit.*

He next falls upon particular men, and begins with Dr. Comber, *whoſe Book he ſays, was firſt* ſet forth by him in the time of the pretended Plot, *and is ſo full of* falſe Quotations, *that they* can be produced by Dozens.

But theſe things ſhould not have been aſſerted ſo boldly, for the Author *of* that Book *printed it firſt in* 1674. *which is four years ſooner than our Jeſuit (who it ſeems knows better than he) will have it*; *and a* third Edition *of it with all the* Quotations, *was Licenſed before the end of* 1676.

1676. *As for the* dozens of false Quotations *which the* Jesuit *says are in that Book; let him produce them assoon as he pleases, I can assure him, he shall not fail of an Answer, not only to them, but to those* two *his Friend the* Representer *hath already attackt.*

As for the Answerer *to the* Address, *whom the* Jesuit *next tells us was run down for an* ignorant Scribler, *I will only tell him, that the* Addresser *may very quickly hear from that* worthy Person; *who will convince them both, that we have no bad Cause to defend, and that he is no unskilful Defender of it.*

And now the Jesuit *is got to Dr.* Sherlocks Preservative, *where I shall take leave of him, and commit him to the Honest Footman, who does here undertake him; but before I conclude this, I think it fit to give the Reader some account of the* Defence *of the* Doctors Book *against the* Jesuit, *which I am here publishing.*

It was brought to my hands by the young man himself, who had been directed to me by a Friend. The reasons of his writing it, and encountering the Jesuit, I believe I have guessed before; and those that will peruse the Jesuits Paper, will I question not, be of my mind. He did with a great deal of Modesty, commit it to my Disposal; I told him I would Print it, since I was very well satisfied with it. However, that the Reader may suspect no fraud nor foul play, I do profess here upon the word of a Christian, that I have committed it to the Press as it was delivered me by the young Man himself, in his own hand-writing, without the addition, or taking away of one word, or altering one Sentence or Line, so that the Reader will have it just as I had; excepting the falseness of the English, which is pardonable enough in a poor Servant, that was very young deprived of his Parents, and never had more Learning than to read English: however, upon this, I order'd the Bookseller to speak to his

Com-

To the Reader.

Compoſitor *at the Preſs, to correct the Engliſh as he ſets it.*

I hope none will be angry that I encourage ſo mean a perſon ſo far, as to help his Book to the Preſs againſt the Jeſuit, *none of our Church will be angry, and none of theirs ought, ſince they ſhould remember, it is not ſo long ſince, that one of their Foot-Soldiers was for fighting a Pen-duel with the* Reverend *and* very Worthy *Dr.* Teniſon, *(whom the* Jeſuit *in this* very Paper *could not avoid Slandering) and publiſhed a thing called a Book againſt that worthy perſon: the inequality betwixt whom is, I take it, far greater than betwixt my* Writer *and the* Jeſuit: *and there is another greater difference in the buſineſs; for my man treats the Jeſuit throughout with reſpect, and gives him no ill Language: Had the other done ſo, it would as I conceive, have been no diſparagement either to his Cauſe, or his Profeſſion.*

And ſo I commit the Book to the Peruſal of the Reader, whoſe favour I will not beſpeak for it, ſince it is ſo able to ſpeak for it ſelf, and will only wiſh it good ſpeed.

Poſt-

POSTSCRIPT.

I Must not forget to advertise the Reader, that as to those Quotations out of *Latin* or *Greek Authors*, which the Young Man is far from understanding, as he declares in his Book, and therefore might justly be suspected to have been added by some other hand; (Upon my enquiry) He told me he had that from *Nicephorus*, out of the Preface to *White's Way to the Church*, and the rest from *Alliaco*, *Scotus* and *Tonstal* out of the *Book* it self, *Digression* 49th, *numb.*9. where I suppose any inquisitive Reader may find them.

Imprimatur,

A *Defence* of Dr. *Sherlock's Preservative*, &c.

May 2. 1688.

Guil. Needham.

A

DEFENCE

OF

Dr. *SHERLOCK*'s Preſervative

AGAINST

POPERY,

IN

Reply to a *JESUITS* Anſwer.

TO begin then with Dr. *Sherlock*'s Principles, which *overthrow all right uſe of common Senſe:* For the firſt, the Anſwerer tells us it is *Page* the Third, and there I find the Doctor blaming the Church of *Rome for not ſuffering her people to Diſpute their Religion, or to read Heretical Books, nay not ſo much us to look into the Bible it ſelf*; which he Repeats thus, *They will not allow the reading Heretical Books*, leaving out what was ſaid of the Bible, it being too hot for him; he could not deny the Fact, nor had courage enough to Defend it, but ſaith,

His reason cannot teach him how God should require the Reading of Heretical Books; and so takes it for granted, that all the Writings of our Divines are so, nay and the Bible it self too, if he will keep to the Doctors words. Well, but *there are some Ministers* (in the Moon possibly, for we cannot learn where) *that use all endeavours to hinder their Flock from hearing Catholick Sermons and reading Catholick Books*. Catholick Sermons, blessed be God, we do or may hear, every Lords day at least, yea and read Catholick Books too; ay! but he means *Roman Catholick Books* and *Sermons*, let it be so, and desire him to tell you who it is that ever forbid his People to hear a Sermon, or read one of their Books, I confess this ought to be done with caution, knowing we have to do with them who make it their practise to deceive. For my part I gladly profess my self a Member, though an unworthy one, of the Church of *England*, and hope God will ever give me Grace to do it: and I have, according to the liberty which God and that Church hath given me, read several Books, not refusing his Catholick ones, not being contented with an Implicit Faith, especially when I read in the Sacred Scripture a command, *to be ready to give an Answer to every one that should ask a Question of the Hope which is in us, to try the Spirits, and to try all things*, and the like; and I know not but I may still do the same, as that small allowance of time, which one in my circumstances can expect, will afford me, for as *Dionysius Alexandrinus* saith (*Niceph. l. 6. c.* 8.) 'He 'used sometimes to be occupied in reading the Writings 'and Treatises of Hereticks, though it something pol-'luted his mind with touching their unclean Opinions, 'because he reaped this profit thereby, that he might 'the easier refell them, and the more execrate and de-'test them.

Pre-

Preſervative againſt Popery, *p.*4.) 'Ask them whether 'they will allow you to judge for your ſelves in matters 'of Religion, if they will not, why will they trouble you 'with diſputing, you cannot be convinc'd unleſs you judg 'too, and thereby reſolve Faith into a private Spirit. — 'Here let our Proteſtant fix his Foot, and not ſtir an inch 'till they diſown Infallibility; and confeſs, that every 'man can and muſt judge for himſelf, in matters of Re-'ligion, according to the proofs that are offer'd to him.

Anſwerer, This is to ſay, *'Tis impoſſible to convince a man that in reaſon he ought to ſubmit his Judgment to that of any other, though Infallible.* But how doth this Inference follow, it appears plain and natural to me, that I may ſubmit my Judgment to an Infallible Judge, and yet the Church of *Rome* may not be that Judge; muſt I ſubmit my Sence and Reaſon to be govern'd by the Pope, or elſe own it impoſſible to be convinc'd by Reaſon that I may do it to an Infallible Judge. Upon my word, Sir, if you will but prove your Church Infallible, I'le immediately forſake that Church which at preſent I think my ſelf very happy in, for yours. Doth this pretty Logic, as you call it, make void all the right uſe of common ſence and reaſon, when it ſhould lead us to ſubmit to any juſt Authority? ſurely no, but argues that we may make uſe of them to judge betwixt a juſt Authority and an Impoſture that uſurps that name. The Doctor doth not take the *Jews part againſt St.* Paul, nor bid us not harken to him till he diſown *Infallibility*; 'tis the product of your own brain: when you can give us ſuch proofs for your Infallibility, as he did, we ſhall own it, till then, we are content to be in the number of your Hereticks.

Preſervative, *Fol.6.* 'What difference is there between 'Mens uſing their private Judgments to turn Papiſts, or to 'turn Proteſtants? The Anſwerer tells us, *Page* the 4. *That 'tis the ſame as between two ſick Men, the one whereof chooſes to put himſelf in an able Doctors hands, whom he knows to have an Infallible Remedy, whilſt the other chooſes his own Simples, and makes his own Medicine.* Well, and is not here private Judgment uſed all this while? doth not he that puts himſelf into this able Doctors hands, uſe his private Judgment as well as the other? and is not the Doctor as much obliged to him for it; for if he did not uſe his Judgment how could he find out this able Doctor, or know that he had an Infallible Remedy? So that what Dr. *Sherlock* ſaid is true, 'That you are as much 'obliged to private Judgments for your Converts as 'Proteſtants can be.

Well but now, he tells us, the Doctor takes the Catholick's part, and though faintly, yet ſpeaks well in ſo clear a cauſe, (Preſervative, *Fol.* 9.) 'The intention of 'theſe Diſputes, is only to lead you to the Infallible 'Church, and ſet you upon a Rock; and then it is very 'natural to renounce your own Judgment, when you 'have an Infallible Guide. But now for convincing Reaſons againſt this plain Truth, as he calls it; the firſt is as he repeats it thus, *They cannot with any ſence Diſpute with us, about the particular Articles of Faith, becauſe the ſence given of Scripture and Fathers takes its Authority from the Church underſtanding it ſo.* This he is pleaſed to ſay, *is falſe; the ſence takes it's Authority from God who ſpake that Word. But how if that ſence be not there? Yes, the Spirit of God is to abide with her* (i. e. *the Church of* Rome) *for ever,* John 14.16. *and ſo ſhe cannot err.* I wonder how our Adverſaries can ſo palpably wreſt ſuch Texts, eſpecially conſidering that they have ſo often been told of it by

by our Divines. But to return, the Doctor having ſaid, 'That if we ſhould admit of the former Plea, that then 'firſt, it puts an end to all the particular Diſputes of Religion between us and the Chuch of *Rome*; we may Di'ſpute on about an Infallible Judge, but they cannot with 'any ſence Diſpute with us about the particular Articles 'of Faith, ſuch as Tranſubſtantiation, the Sacrifice of 'the Maſs, the Worſhip of Images, and the like; for 'theſe are to be learnt only from the Church, and can'not be proved by Scripture or Fathers, without the Au'thority of the Church. But you ſee how he pares the words, and to ſhow you that this Charge is true, I ſhall only mention ſomething upon the firſt Point, *viz.* Tranſubſtantiation, out of their own Writers, and though I never read their Books, nor do underſtand any other Language than my own, yet I am ſo ſure that they are honeſtly quoted, that I challenge any Romaniſt to prove the Contrary. *Petrus de Alliaco* the Cardinal ſaith, (4. *V.6.Art.2.f.*) 'That manner which ſuppoſeth the ſubſtance 'of Bread to remain ſtill is poſſible, neither is it contrary 'to reaſon, or to the Authority of Scripture; nay it is ea'ſier to conceive, and more reaſonable than that which 'ſays the Subſtance doth leave the Accidents; and of this 'Opinion no inconvenience doth ſeem to enſue, if it could 'be accorded with the Churches determination. *Scotus* ſaith (*Script. Oxon.*4.*D.*11.*q.*3.§*quantum ergo ad iſtum*). 'Principally this ſeemeth to move us to hold Tranſubſtan'tiation, becauſe concerning the Sacraments we are to 'hold as the Church of *Rome* doth. And (4.*d.*14.*q.*3.*Bill.* '*Enchar.L.*3.*C.*23. there is no Scripture to convince it, un'leſs ye bring the Church of *Romes* expoſition. *Tonſtal* 'ſaith (*de verit.Corp.* & *Sang. p.*46.) That it was free for 'all men, till the Councel of *Lateran*, to follow their own 'conjectures as concerning the manner of the Preſence.

This

This ſhows upon what account Popery is believed, and with what reſpect they treat Scripture, making it in deed what they have called it, *A Noſe of Wax*, that ſo it might be flexible to cover their Errors. Now if the ſence they contend for cannot be proved from thoſe Texts which they bring for it, nor is contained in Scripture, but that another ſence may be had without any inconveniency; that is more eaſie to conceive, and more reaſonable, but that the Church of *Rome* hath determined otherwiſe: Surely we may conclude, that the Scripture takes its Authority from the Church, underſtanding it ſo, ſeeing they believe it wholly upon that account, and would believe otherwiſe, were it not for that Reaſon.

Preſervative, &c. fol. 11. 'Ask them whether the belief 'of an Infallible Judge muſt be reſolved into every mans 'private Judgment? whether it be not neceſſary to be-'lieve this with a Divine Faith? and whether there can be 'a Divine Faith without an Infallible Judge? (Anſwerer p. 4.) *There can be no Divine Faith without a Divine Revelation, true; and therefore if you will have one with a Divine Faith, believe that there is an Infallible Viſible Judge, nay, that the* Pope *is he, pray ſhew me a Divine Revelation for it.*

Anſwerer, p. 5.) *No underſtanding Proteſtant can be diſputed into* Popery, *which owns an Infallible Church*, &c. But the Doctors words are, *No underſtanding Proteſtant can be diſputed into this kind of* Popery, i. e. *That the Church is Infallible, and that the Church of* Rome *is that Infallible Church, and then gives his Reaſons; firſt, no arguments can give me an infallible certainty of the Infallibility of the Church.* (f. the 17.) Now what ſaith the Anſwerer; why hear him, *We ſaw* Dr. Sherlock *juſt now plead-*

pleading for the Jews againſt St. Paul, *now he Reaſons even againſt Chriſt our God bleſſed for evermore* (juſt alike indeed Sir) *his words prove that Chriſt who own'd himſelf Infallible, did imprudently ſo* Preach *or work Miracles* ---- *Arguments ſo offenſive to pious ears* (mentioned 2 *Tim.* 4. 3.) *ought to meet with no other Anſwer than Prayers for him who offers them.* And doth this indeed follow from the Doctors words? is the compariſon all one between your Reaſons and Arguments, for your Churches Infallibility, and thoſe which Chriſt offered with the addition of Miracles? And yet though he was Infallible, and did work Miracles to confirm his Doctrine, he did not command them to be content with an Implicit Faith, but the contrary, *Search the Scriptures*, John 5. and 39. and *Mark* 12. and the 24. tells them, *They erred not knowing the Scriptures.* Beſides, Sirs, could there not be a true certainty without Infallibility? doth Dr. *Sherlock* ſay, *That the Jews could not be Diſputed into Faith, unleſs that Faith were Infallible?* no, he leaves that to be talked of by you who are the great pretenders to it.

Ibid. 'It is impoſſible by Reaſon to prove, that Men 'muſt not uſe their own Reaſon and Judgment in matters 'of Religion. Anſwerer, *That Men muſt uſe Reaſon to come to the Knowledge that God hath revealed what they believe is very certain* ----- *But after that there is no further uſe of Reaſon, if we believe St.* Paul, *but in order to the bringing into Captivity all underſtanding into the obedience of Chriſt*, 1 of *Corinth* the 10. his meaning is, that he will allow you to uſe your Reaſon, ſo long as it leads you to the Church of *Rome*; but if once you find any thing to cotradict that, you muſt immediately renounce it, and not expect Sence and Reaſon from an Infallible Church, which is above all that; but methinks if my

Sence

Sence and Reaſon will ſerve me to find out an Infallible Church, it is a little ſevere to renounce it when I come there. We do not find in Scripture that they did or were required to do thus, nay the contrary, and yet ſure the Apoſtles were as Infallible as the Church can pretend to be now, 1 Epiſtle of *John* 4. 1. *Believe not every Spirit, but try the Spirits whether they be of God.* 1 Corinth. 10. 15. *I ſpeak as to wiſe Men, judge ye what I ſay*; and *Acts* 17. 11. *We have this particular commendation of the* Bereans, *that they were more noble than thoſe of* Theſſalonica, *in that they received the Word with all readideſs of mind, and ſearched the Scriptures dayly, to ſee whether what they heard were conformable thereto or no.*

Preſervative, *&c. Fol.* 21.) 'We have as much aſſurance of every Article of our Faith, as you have of the 'Infallibility of your Church; firſt, becauſe we are in general aſſured that the Scripture are the Word of God. Anſwerer, *Hitherto there holds ſome parity, though but lame, but ſuppoſe it were entire, the Concluſion would be this, Catholicks ase as certain of the ſence of Scripture as Proteſtants are that they have the Letter.* But don't you forget, Sir, that Infallibility is the Point Diſputed, you ſay indeed you have it, but ye are Judges in your own Cauſe, none own it but your ſelves; but the Scripture all Chriſtians own to be the Word of God, yea and we have the concurrent Teſtimonies of all Churches that we have thoſe Canonical Books, and have we no better ground for our Belief in that Point than you have for the other, ſeeing you contradict and Diſpute againſt all man-kind, and are fain to take it upon your own word, with the wreſting of a Text or two to ſpeak for the Church of *Rome*, which is to have

have no other Limitation than to the Church Univerſal; but if your Church be not Infallible (which you know we ſay) what warrant can you have for the receiving of particular points of Faith, wholly becauſe ſhe teacheth them? Here if you are not ſound in the firſt point, all the reſt will tumble. But now Proteſtants have all the certainty imaginable for the Rule of their Faith, and for the particular points of it; becauſe they prove them from the Word of God, which is their Rule. But let us ſuppoſe a while that your Church were Infallible, what greater Certainty (for that is the point you know which the Doctor was upon) have you of it, than we have of any particular point of Faith? As for the Certainty of Reaſon and Argument, that we have, and would fain ſee you ſhew more; what we believe is according to Scripture, and doth not contradict either Senſe or Reaſon, nor any other Principle of Knowledge; which you know the People of your Church are not to ſtand upon; but to ſubmit to her teaching, let her teach how ſhe will, becauſe ſhe is ſuppoſed to be Infallible, though they have no greater certainty of it, than Proteſtants have for any ſingle point; which makes it ridiculous indeed, for any Man to forſake the Church of *England* for the Church of *Rome*, upon the account of greater Certainty.

Preſervative, *Ibid.* Seconly, *and in particular, we are aſſured that the Faith which we profeſs is agreeable to Scripture.* Thus far the Anſwerer: but the Doctor added, *or expreſly contained in it, and does not contradict either Senſe or Reaſon, nor any other Principle of Knowledge.* Now what ſaith the Anſwerer? why, *If he means that they have the ſame Proof for this, which Catholicks have for the Infallibility of the Church, that is, for the Being of that*

Church whicr declares her ſelf Infallible (for a Church erring in ſuch a point, would ceaſe to be the Church of Chriſt) then 'tis evidently falſe, ſince each Chriſtian in this Age hath the ſame Evidence of her being the Church of Chriſt, and of her teaching Truth, and conſequently of her Infallibility, which he hath of Chriſt, viz. *Propheſies, Miracles,* &c. *which no Proteſtant ſo much as challengeth for the certainty of the particular Senſe of Scripture; the ſame proofs which Catholicks have for the Infallibility of the Church,* that is, *for the Being of the Church:* This is a pretty conceit, *the Infallibility of the Church,* that is to ſay, *the Being of the Church;* Can't a Church be then without being Infallible? Well! but every *Chriſtian in this Age hath the ſame Evidence of the Church of* Romes *being the Church of Chriſt, and of her teaching Truth, and conſequently of her Infallibility, which he hath of Chriſt,* viz. *Propheſies, Miracles,* &c. And where I pray are theſe things? What! the Evidence ſo plain to all Chriſtians, and yet two parts of three that can ſee no ſuch thing? I confeſs, we have heard much of Miracles, but could never ſee any; if they have any, they are kept to themſelves: but 'tis no matter, for (as a late Author hath it) the greateſt Miracle is, that any man can believe them: I ſhall not repeat any; they are common enough; any one that hath a mind to a whole Book full, need but enquire for the *School of the Euchariſt,* and I believe he will have ſatisfaction.

Preſervative, *&c. fol.* 23.) *If you muſt not uſe your Reaſon and private Judgment, then you muſt not by any Reaſons be perſwaded to condemn the uſe of Reaſon.* This is a plain caſe; for as the Doctor adds, *to condemn is an act of Judgment:* But the Anſwerer ſaith, *All this might with equal weight be ſaid by a ſick Man, who diſſwaded from*

from chooſing his own Remedies, and deſired to ſend for a skilful Doctor, ſhould anſwer, 'Tis impoſſible by Reaſon to perſuade me not to uſe my Reaſon, in governing my ſelf by Reaſon, as my own Reaſon teacheth me; which would be to condemn Reaſon, and yet be guided by your Reaſon; ſuch Diſcourſe would prove the Sick Man, at leaſt ſomewhat Light-headed. What 'tis a Symptom of in Dr. *Sherlock*, his Modeſty will not let him be poſitive in. But, Sir, Is this ſame Sick Man, when he is deſired to ſend for ſome able Doctor, perſuaded too to renounce his Reaſon, or rather, is it not that he ſhould ſubmit his Judgment (not renounce his Reaſon) in that caſe, to that Perſon whom he hath all the reaſon in the World to believe, hath better knowledge and underſtanding of thoſe things which are to be us'd for his Recovery than himſelf? And all this while, methinks he is govern'd by Reaſon, though he doth not think fit to truſt his own Skill; 'tis the Doctor's Profeſſion to know what Medicines are fit to be uſed in ſuch and ſuch Caſes and Conſtitutions, which I never trouble my ſelf about, and therefore ſurely I may be govern'd by him, without renouncing my Reaſon; nay, 'tis Reaſon that makes me do it. But this bears no Compariſon; Religion is, or ought to be the concern of all; Phyſical Speculations, thoſe only who are pleaſed to make it their Study: Every one muſt believe for himſelf, but every one is not obliged to be his own Doctor.

Preſervative, *&c.* fol. 25.) *We muſt allow of no Reaſon againſt the Authority of plain and expreſs Scripture.---- We may reaſonably conclude, that God underſtands the reaſons and nature of things better than we.* This the Anſwerer ſaith, is a *very true and Catholick Principle.* Whence we may infer, That when the Doctor comes to apply

it, that he will be guilty of ſome moſt Illogical Inference. Alas for Dr. *Sherlock!* who can hold no Catholick Principle, but what muſt have ſome Illogical Inference attending it to ſpoil all; but let's hear it: *Thou ſhalt Worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve, is ſuch a plain and expreſs Scripture, that no Reaſon can juſtifie the Worſhip of another Being.* And what ſaith the Anſwerer to this, ſure ſome great matter, ſince he prepared his Reader before-hand with a *Behold? Why 'tis like this, A Subject muſt love his King, and owe Allegiance to him alone; therefore no Reaſon can juſtifie the love of a Child for his Father, or of a Wife for her Husband.* What a delicate piece of Sophiſtry is here! But 'tis no matter, his deſign is to confound us unlearned Hereticks: But Sirs, the Command is, to *ſerve God only*; which Service, we muſt of neceſſity underſtand to be that which is Divine; but worſhip is ſo: wherefore it irreſiſtibly follows, that we muſt not Worſhip any other Being, but what we are here commanded to ſerve, which is, *God alone:* So your ſimilitude will not hold. I am to love my King, (and I thank God I do it heartily) and to owe all Allegiance to him, but I may love another to whom I owe no Allegiance; but to Worſhip a Being, I can't without ſerving that; Being wherefore the Text is plain againſt the Worſhip of any other but God.

Preſervative, *&c.* fol. 26. *and in the Anſwer*, page 6. *The ſenſe of the Law is the Law—— but when the Law is not capable of a different ſenſe, or there is no ſuch Reaſon as makes one ſenſe abſurd, and the other neceſſary, the Law muſt be expounded according to the moſt plain and obvious ſenſe of the words.* Anſwerer; *This Principle is ſound.* You may then be ſure of a falſe Inference at the heel of it, juſt as before. Surely this Gentleman is one

of

of *Momus*'s Race, whom nothing could pleaſe. They write of him, Thot none of the Gods could do any thing but he had a quarrel at it; when *Neptune* had made a Bull, *Vulcan* a Man, and *Minerva* a Houſe, he quarell'd at the Bull becauſe the Horns ſtood on his Head; the Man, becauſe he had not a Window in his Breaſt; the Houſe, becauſe it ſtood not upon Wheels, to remove it when it ſtood not well; and when *Venus* walked by, ſmiling at his conceit, he told her, ſhe was not well made neither; and her Shoes made too much creaking as ſhe went. But for the Doctor's falſe Inference; and this is it, *Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelf any Image*, &c. which is ſo expreſs a Law againſt Image-Worſhip, that no Reaſon muſt be admitted for it; and what hath he to ſay to this? Why, there are two Queſtions which he thinks cannot be Anſwer'd, but that the Doctor's falſe Inference will appear,: Firſt then, *What if you be told, that although the Jews had perhaps a Command of making no graven Image*, &c. *yet this being a poſitive Law, and not confirmed in the Goſpel, doth not oblige us? Will this reaſon be admitted? No; and yet you have no other motive to paſs by as expreſs a Law of Sanctifying* Saturday. And do you indeed Sir, think it all one? Is it not held on all hands, that the keeping of the Seventh day was Figurative, and ſo aboliſh'd at the Death of Chriſt? But ſo far as it was Moral, namely, that a Seventh day ſhould be kept, that ſtill remains. Beſides, were we, or Chriſt and his Apoſtles, Authors of this change? Chriſt as he roſe on that day, ſo he did uſually appear on that day to his Diſciples: And doth not the Scripture maintain the Celebration of it by the conſtant practice of the Apoſtles, *Acts* 20. & 7. 1 *Corinthians* 16. & 21. which ſhews, that we have better foundation for our Belief in this point, than you who rely on Tradition. Well!

but

but ſuppoſe it be rejoyn'd, that only the making to themſelves (by private Authority) an Idol to adore it with Divine Worſhip is forbidden, can none of theſe Reaſons be heard? no; then Bezeleel *by God's command, making ſeveral likeneſſes of things on Earth,* Solomon *placing ſuch in the Temple, ſinned againſt the Firſt Commandment——— The truth is, what ſenſe they put on any Text, is the expreſs Law, againſt which, no Reaſon muſt be heard; ſo they challenge to themſelves the Infallibility which they ſo ſturdily deny to the Church of God.* For Anſwer to this then, firſt, we do not challenge the Infallibility which the polluted and degenerate Church of *Rome* (which he calls the Church of God) claims: For ſhe would have us take the ſenſe of any Scripture upon her own word; and becauſe ſhe ſo teacheth, we muſt ſubmit to her definitions; and for this reaſon, Becauſe ſhe hath defined them: 'Tis not for private Chriſtians to examin particular points of their Faith or Religion; no, 'tis ſufficient to ſubmit to an Infallible Guide; and that too, if he declares as the Council of *Conſtance* did, *Seſſion* 13. concerning the Euchariſt, *That notwithſtanding our Lord did inſtitute it in both kinds, and the Apoſtles ſo celebrated it, yet now it ſhould not be ſo*; which was confirmed by the Council of *Trent*, Seſſ. 21. But for us Proteſtants, we cannot think that any Reaſon can be ſufficient to lay aſide an expreſs Text. Well, but how ſhall we excuſe *Bezeleel* and *Solomon* from ſinning againſt the Firſt Commandment? Why truly that is very eaſie; for 'tis plain, that they did not make them for any Religious Worſhip, neither did they pay any Adoration to them. And what compariſon this hath to the Practice of the Church of *Rome* at this day, I ſhall leave to any Man who hath any knowledge of their Religion, to judge.

And

And now (in good time) he tells us he will conclude the Doctor's admirable Principles and Inferences (i. e. *that make void all right uſe of common Senſe and Reaſon*) with one ſo ſingular, that it deſerves to be obſerved by all: And truly it doth ſo, but it is of his own coyning; take it in his own Words, *page 6. No Argument from the neceſſity of a thing muſt be admitted to prove it is; if there be no Infallible Judge, there can be no certainty of Faith.* —— *Tho it be true, and you think it to be true, you muſt not allow this conſequence, therefore there is one.*—*Such Arguments do not prove that there be ſuch a Judge, but that there ought to be.* Now to ſee the Diſingenuity (to ſay no worſe) of this Author, we muſt look into the Doctor's Books, and there, (*fol.* 44.) he tells us, That *we ſhould never admit any Arguments merely from the uſefulneſs, conveniency, or ſuppoſed neceſſity of any thing to prove it is.* Now the Anſwerer leaves out the word *ſuppoſed*, and ſo makes that abſolute, which was only conditional, (*fol.* 45.) *if there be not an Infallible Judge, there can be no certainty in Religion:* This the Doctor ſaid; but for whom, I pray, for himſelf, or for the Roman Catholick? and therefore he goes on, *If I thought all this were true, (as I believe not a Word of it is) I ſhould only conclude, that it is great pity that there is not an Infallible Judge inſtituted by Chriſt: But if you would have me conclude from theſe premiſes,* Ergo, *there is an infallible Judge of Controverſies, I muſt beg your pardon for that; for ſuch Arguments as theſe do not prove, that there is ſuch a Judge, but only that there ought to be one, and therefore I muſt conclude no more from them. Indeed this is a very fallacious way of reaſoning, becauſe what we may call uſeful, convenient, neceſſary, may not be ſo in it ſelf; and we have reaſon to believe it is not ſo, if God have not appointed what we think ſo uſeful,*

con-

convenient, and necessary, which is a truer and more modest way of reasoning, than to conclude, that God has appointed such a Judge, when no such thing appears, only because we think it so useful and necessary that he ought to do it : And now I would fain know who it is that denies Wisdom and Reason in God.

And thus I have run through that Point, which the Answerer told us he would enlarge upon, *i. e. Reason*, which to defend Protestancy, we must make void, for so fam'd an Author as Dr. *Sherlock*, could not support it, he saith, *without making void all Reason*, which Charge, how well he hath proved, the Reader is to judge.

To go on then, the Principles of Dr. *Sherlock*, which *make void all Faith*, follow next, which if I can but find, we are to take notice of ; and I shall not say any thing to that long Harangue, which the Answerer makes, before he tells us where they be ; not that I think it unanswerable, but because it is that which hath been so often answered by our Divines, and what they can say nothing to, but repeat over their old Objections again, that so, if possible, they might keep those Learned Men from better Employment. For the first then, the Answerer tells us it is *fol.* 78. mistaken for *fol.* 79. & 80. where the Doctor puts the case thus : *Suppose the Protestant Faith uncertain, how is the Cause of the Church of* Rome *ever the better ? Is* Thomas *an honest Man, because* John *is a Knave ?* To this he answers, *That if* Thomas *and* John *be accused severally of Theft, and the stoln Goods be found with* John, *I conceive, though this prove not* Thomas *so assuredly an honest Man, yet an honest Jury would, he conceives, bring him in* not Guilty. *That there is a true Faith, and consequently a certain Rule*

of

of Faith all Chriſtians acknowledge, Proteſtants on one ſide chooſe one Rule, (how differently ever they apply it) Catholicks another ; I conceive then if the Proteſtant Rule be proved uncertain, 'tis plain the Catholicks Rule muſt be the certain one. But for Anſwer to this conceit, which I confeſs made me ſmile at the Reading, and to begin with *John* and *Thomas* for the firſt, *The ſtoln Goods are found with him, and ſo he's Condemn'd ; but now for the proof of that* Thomas *is an honeſt Man, and I ſee no neceſſity that he ſhould be ſo, unleſs there was nothing for him to ſteal but what* John *had got ; nay, unleſs it be alſo proved that he had no hand in the taking of thoſe* Goods *which were found with* John, *which he might have, and ſo be equally guilty with him, notwithſtanding their being found with another. And ſo for Proteſtants and Roman Catholicks, one chooſe one Rule and the 'tother another ; and ſuppoſe the Proteſtants Rule be proved falſe, doth it indeed neceſſarily follow that the Catholicks muſt be the true?* I conceive, Sir, that you muſt firſt prove that it is impoſſible for people to make to themſelves two wrong Rules, which I preſume will be labour. Suppoſe I ſhould tell you that there were two Men which were to go to ſuch a City or Town, but could not agree in their Judgments concerning the neareſt way which lead to it, and ſo took two ſeveral ways, and conclude, when one of them had been prov'd to err, that the way which the other took muſt be the neareſt way, which was to go to that City or Town, and ſo the true and right way : Would you not Anſwer me, That that did not follow, for there might be a third, and ſo a nearer than either of the former, and that they might both err ; wherefore if you could prove the Proteſtant Rule uncertain, I do not ſee how it appears ſo plain, as you would perſuade me, that your Catholick one is the right.

What can be the Gentleman's meaning in his next affected Paragraph, I cannot conceive, unleſs it be this, *That becauſe Proteſtants take the Reaſons of their Faith from Scripture, and not from the Church of* Rome, *that therefore they can have no certain or Divine Faith,* which if it be, I pity him; if it be not, I muſt deſire him to explain himſelf.

Preſervative, *&c. ibid.*) *We believe the Apoſtles Creed, and whatever is contained in the Writings of the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles, and this is all we believe: And, I hope, they will not ſay that theſe things are uncertain.* Anſwer, *page 7. They are in themſelves very certain, but not to any Proteſtant, whoſe Rule of Faith cannot make him certain of any one Article;* this is pleaſant, theſe things are certain, but the Scripture, which is our Rule, cannot make us certain of any one Article contain'd in it; which ſhews demonſtratively upon what account they hold their Religion, and believe the Articles of their Faith, not becauſe they find them in Scripture, for that cannot make them certain that they are there, but becauſe their Church ſo teacheth, which is the thing he means; that God hath given ſufficient means to come to the knowledge of, if we would but uſe them: Well, but the Doctor's Anſwer, juſtifies Turk, Jew and Gentile, and how, I pray, do they believe all that is contain'd in the Writings of the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles which we do? and which you cannot deny, but with a little grumbling, becauſe we will not receive it upon the Authority of your Church, with thoſe additions which ſhe is graciouſly pleas'd to make.

Preſervative, *&c.* fol. 81.) *If theſe things,* i. e. *the Writings of the Apoſtles, &c. be not built upon certain Reaſons*

ſons, their Infallible Church can have no certainty of the Chriſtian Faith. Anſwer, *this is moſt notoriouſly falſe, ſince ſhe is not Infallible by any light of her own, but by the guidance of the Spirit of Truth. Were not the Apoſtles certain of what Chriſt told them, when they had acknowledg'd him the Son of God, before he gave them certain Reaſons for it 'tis a blind Impiety even to think ſo.* Patience good Sir, and only be pleaſed to tell me whether therein were a certain Faith without certain Reaſon or no? As for what the Doctor ſaid it is undoubtedly true, for as he ſaith but juſt before, *Infallibility cannot make that certain, which is in it ſelf uncertain: an infallible Man muſt know things as they are, or elſe he is miſtaken, and ceaſes to be Infallible; and therefore what is certain, he infallibly knows to be certain, and what is uncertain, he infallibly knows to be uncertain: for the moſt certain and infallible knowledge does not change its Object, but ſees it juſt as it is.* Wherefore ſuppoſing your Church had the guidance of the Spirit of Truth to make her Infallible in all things, ſhe muſt certainly ſee things as they are: wherefore the Scripture muſt be the Word of God, and what is therein contained certain, becauſe ſhe ſo Teacheth, or elſe ſhe ceaſeth to be Infallible.

Preſervative, *&c. fol.* 82) *'Tis their common Argument, That there is a great variety of Opinions among Proteſtants, and that they condemn one another with equal confidence and aſſurance.* But the Anſwerer ſaith, he ſhould have added, *Though they uſe the ſame Rule of Faith, and apply it by the ſame means, and that thus propos'd 'tis an unanſwerable argument againſt our Rule of Faith, and evidently proves it uncertain.* Alas for us now, we are gone with a witneſs, our Rule being prov'd uncertain, we muſt certainly err if we rely upon it: yet chear up, we

have heard this unanſwerable Argument Anſwer'd, particularly by the Reverend Dr. *Stillingfleet*, in his Anſwer to *J. S*'s Catholick Letters; but 'tis a Talent inherent in a Romaniſt, to repeat his old muſty Arguments without taking notice of what hath been ſaid in Anſwer thereto. But I muſt beg leave a while to look into the forenamed book, and there I find a full Anſwer to what is here ſaid; *J. S.* having ſaid, *That Scripture interpreted by private Judgment was not the way to know certainly what Chriſt and his Apoſtles taught, becauſe they that made uſe of it that way did not agree, but differ'd in Fundamentals*, (In his Firſt Letter). The Doctor Anſwers, *Fol.* 39. *Thus it doth not follow, by no means, that the Scripture is no certain Rule*; and he puts it thus, according to *J. S*'s Propoſitions, Firſt, *Arithmetick preſcribes a certain way by Addition and Subſtraction for us to find out any Sum.* Secondly, *Therefore it muſt be ſuch, that they who take it ſhall arrive by it at the exact Sum.* Thirdly, *But two Men who have made uſe of the ſame way, differ at leaſt a Hundred in caſting up the Sum.* Fouthly, *Therefore Arithmetick doth not preſcribe a certain way to attain at a certain Sum.* Fifthly, *Therefore they who take only that way, cannot by it arrive at the certain Sum.* *But*, ſaith he, *Fol.* 40. *thoſe who conſider a little better than Mr. S. hath done, will diſtinguiſh between the Rule and the Application of it; the Rule of Arithmetick may be nevertheleſs certain, although thoſe who want skill or care and diligence, may miſtake in caſting up a particular accompt. The ſame we ſay here, Scripture is a certain Rule in all Fundamental Points, to ſuch as have capacity, and uſe due care and diligence in finding them; but we do not deny but Men through prejudice, weakneſs, want of Attention, Authority of falſe Teachers, impatience of throughly examining things, and not uſing proper helps, may run into groſs Errors*— But

Still

ſtill the Rule is certain to thoſe who uſe it aright. Fol. 41. *For although the Scripture be an infallible Rule, yet unleſs every Man that makes uſe of it be infallible, he may miſtake in the application of it.* I deſire the Gentleman to take this into Conſideration, and if he think it not ſufficient, to try his skill upon Dr. *Stillingfleet.*

Preſervative, *&c. Fol.* 83.) *Were all Proteſtants of a mind, would their Conſent and Agreement prove the certainty of the Proteſtant Faith?* The Anſwerer ſaith, *Not at all, yet that it is a moſt ridiculous Inference of Dr.* Sherlock, *that this is the ſame Rule, and their Diſagreement proves their Uncertainty; all Union is no Argument of the Spirit of God; for People may combine to do ill; yet S.* Paul *aſſures us, Diſunion and Deſertion is a certain Mark of the abſence of the Spirit of God:* You ſhould have added, in ſome, not in all the diſagreeing Parties: For ſuppoſe, Sir, the Queſtion be put among a Company of Men to go rob ſuch a Houſe, or kill ſuch a Man; ſome of them conſent to it, but there are others which will not; I deſire to know, whether it be a mark of the abſence of the Spirit of God in thoſe which do not agree to do that Wickedneſs? And ſo you ſee what the Doctor's moſt ridiculous Inference comes to, and how he hath *made void all Faith.*

But now for Dr. *Sherlock*'s Poſition, which *makes void all Scripture-proof*, as it lies in the Anſwer, *page* the *7th. If a Myſtery appear againſt Senſe and Reaſon, we muſt have a Scripture-proof as cannot poſſibly ſignifie any thing elſe, or elſe it will not anſwer that Evidence which we have againſt it, Senſe and Reaſon proving it naturally impoſſible. A Text*, he ſaith, *which cannot poſſibly have another Senſe, doth not leave it in any ones Liberty, who owns Siripture, to*

be

be an Heretick; therefore the Church produced no ſuch Text againſt the Arians *or* Neſtorians; *whence it evidently follows, that according to Dr.* Sherlock, *the* Arians *and* Neſtorians *were bound not to believe the Trinity, and the Incarnation of Chriſt. A Happy Miniſterial Guide! And well led thoſe that follow him!* And now, Reader, I muſt deſire you again to look into the Doctor's Book, and read what he ſaith, and there I find that 'tis but *reaſonable that the Evidence for it (i. e. Tranſubſtantiation) ſhould at leaſt be equal to the Evidence againſt it, fol.* 70. *And therefore we muſt demand a ſelf-evident Proof for this, becauſe it is ſelf-evident that* Tranſubſtantiation *contradicts Senſe and Reaſon, fol.* 71. And ſo he ſaith, fol. 72. *That we muſt demand ſuch a Scripture-proof of Tranſubſtantiation, as cannot poſſibly ſignifie any thing elſe, [without contradicting Senſe and Reaſon, as that doth] or elſe it will not anſwer the Evidence which we have againſt Tranſubſtantiation; for Senſe and Reaſon pronounce Tranſubſtantiation to be naturally impoſſible; and therefore, unleſs it be as impoſſible to put any other Senſe upon Scripture, than what ſignifies Tranſubſtantiation, as it is to reconcile Tranſubſtantiation to Senſe and Reaſon, there is not ſuch good Evidence for Tranſubſtantiation as againſt it.* With what Conſcience now can any Man cavil at this, and ſay, *that it makes void all Scripture-proof?* As for the Trinity and Incarnation, which the *Arians* and *Neſtorians* diſputed, they are Myſteries indeed, and might ſeem to be above Senſe and Reaſon, but they are not contrary to it; and it was not neceſſary to produce Scripture, which could not poſſibly ſignifie any thing elſe, that is to ſay, which could not poſſibly have any other Senſe put upon them, without contradicting Senſe and Reaſon; for they could not prove that thoſe which were diſputed did either. But now for Tranſubſtantiation, that that doth,

doth both, is plain; wherefore 'tis but reaſonable to deſire a Scripture-proof that cannot ſignifie any thing elſe but Tranſubſtantiation, without contradicting Senſe and Reaſon, elſe, as the Doctor ſaith, *there is not ſo good Evidence for it as againſt it*; ſo that for ought our Author can ſay, Dr. *Sherlock* is a good Miniſterial Guide, and thoſe may be happy which follow his Guidance; when thoſe who ſeek to pervert Souls, and bring them into a By-way of Darkneſs and Error, may be lamenting abus'd Mercy, and that they made no better uſe of that Talent which God had lent them.

Next comes the Doctor's Poſition, *making void all uſe of Holy Fathers and General Councils*, which to prove, the Anſwerer repeats by halves what the Doctor ſaid, and then concludes, *That ſome of thoſe Requiſits not being poſſibly to be known, no uſe is to be made of any.* What Dr. *Sherlock* ſaid is this; *That 'twas ridiculous for that man that hath been taught his Religion out of the Scripure, and which he might find there if he pleas'd, to change it for Quotations out of the Fathers and Councils which he did not underſtand, becauſe ſome honeſt Prieſt (a ſort of Men who never deceive any one) had told him that ſuch a Father, who lived, it may be, they know not where nor when, and wrote they know not what, has ſpoke in favour of Tranſubſtantiation, or Purgatory, or ſome other Popiſh Doctrin.* And then he comes to tell us what Queſtions we ought to ask, when we are urged with the Authority of Fathers, as, *How we ſhall know that ſuch Books were written by that Father whoſe Name it bears? Whether it be uncorrupted? How we ſhall know the true meaning of thoſe Words which they cite from them, which the Words themſelves many times will not diſcover without the Context*, and the like, which requiſites that Man who will build any

thing

thing upon their Authority, muſt know, or elſe he may be miſerably miſtaken; yet this is not to deny any uſe of Fathers and Councils; for Learned Men may diſpute about them as they pleaſe; and I queſtion not, if our Religion were to be try'd by the Fathers, but that we ſhould undoubtedly carry it againſt the Church of *Rome*, notwithſtanding all her Pretences to Antiquity; and yet we do not build our Faith thereon, but keep to that Rule which they had to walk by, which is the Word of God, contained in the Canonical Books of the Old and New Teſtament.

And now I am arriv'd to the laſt Point, which our candid Anſwerer undertook, *viz.* to ſhew that Dr. *Sherlock made void all Moral Honeſty*, and that he tells us lies in his laſt Chapter, where *to inſinuate, that a Catholick thinks the Bleſſed Virgin more powerful in Heaven than Chriſt, he tells us, that he ſays ten* Ave-Maries *for one* Pater Noſter. Well! for the Matter of Fact, that the Catholick doth ſay Ten Prayers to the Virgin, for one to Chriſt, the Anſwerer can't deny. Ay, but he doth not think her more powerful than Chriſt. Suppoſe that; yet ſure he muſt think her more merciful, and readier to hear his Prayers than Chriſt, or elſe why is he ſo partial to pray Ten for One? which I doubt will prove much of a conſequence with the former: And yet if the Doctor had not only done what he here perſuades us he doth, but directly ſaid it, I know not how he would have excuſed ſome of his own Party: And you know, Sirs, what the Author of the *Remarks upon the Reflections of the Author of Popery Miſrepreſented and Repreſented* hath undertaken, *viz.* this among many other things, to ſhew, when you ſhall deſire it, that there are ſome of your own Writers, who believe the *Bleſſed*

ſed Virgin to have as much Power in Heaven as her Son, and that maintains *the praying to her to command him, and begging from her pardon of Sins, and the aſſurance of Salvation.* To conclude, the Anſwerer tells us, that to be *thorough*-Sherlock, and *thorough-Proteſtant-Miniſter, he concludes with the moſt diſingenuous Miſrepreſentation, and the moſt falſe Calumny imaginable, as a ſuppoſed and owned Truth,* to wit, *That Catholicks worſhip the viſible Species in the Euchariſt: A moſt impudent Slander,* he ſaith, *no Catholick being guilty of it, no more than the Apoſtles of worſhiping and adoring the Cloaths of Chriſt, when they ador'd him upon Earth.* Preſervative, *fol.* 89. *He* (Papiſt Repreſented) *believes it unlawful to commit Idolatry, and moſt damnable to worſhip any Breaden God, which,* ſaith Dr. *Sherlock, is ſpoke like a Proteſtant, but yet he pays Divine Adoration to the Sacrament, which is done like a Papiſt.* Here you ſee is no mention made of Species, but the word is Sacrament; and that they do pay Divine Adoration to that, they can't deny; but then they tell us, *That Chriſt is there, yea, that that Body which was born of the Virgin* Mary, *and that hung upon the Croſs, Fleſh, Bloud, Bones and all is whole in every Point and Crum of the Conſecrated Wafer; and that there remains nothing of the conſecrated Elements; and that'tis this their Adoration is paid to.* But ſurely now they had need to have good Grounds that this is ſo; this had need to be wonderfully clear in Scripture; and yet when they come to prove it thereby, they bring thoſe Words, *This is my Body,* and conclude there is Foundation enough for all this, and much more, as if there were no Figurative Expreſſions in Scripture; and as if there were a neceſſity to take Scripture in a Senſe which contradicts Senſe and Reaſon, when another Senſe more natural and eaſie may be had.

And now to cloſe up all with ſome good Advice for us Proteſtants, and that too in Dr. *Sherlock's* Words, only putting the Word *Scripture* in lieu of *Fathers*, (a little Alteration, do not ſtand upon't; come, come, ſhew a little good nature for once, and take it upon my Word) *Amongſt Chriſtians there is not one in a hundred thouſand who underſtands all Scripture, and it is morally impoſſible they ſhould, and therefore certainly there muſt be an eaſier and ſhorter way to underſtand Chriſtian Religion than this, or elſe the generality of Mankind, even of profeſs'd Chriſtians, are out of poſſibility of Salvation: Think well on it, as you will anſwer at God's Tribunal for the Care you took of the one only Neceſſary, the ſaving of your Souls; ſeek out that eaſier and ſhorter way, and walk faithfully in it.* Good, ee'n cloſe your Eyes, and examin nothing, but come over to our Mother *Rome*, and be reſolute, and I'll warrant an happy Agreement. If this is not to be thorough Papiſt, and thorough Romiſh Prieſt, I know not what is: But to conſider it a little, though the truth is, it doth doth not deſerve it, all Scripture, yes, all Scripture muſt be underſtood, or elſe the Chriſtian Religion cannot: So that if a Man underſtood all the Texts of the Old and New Teſtament, except one, as for Inſtance, that in the *9th* of the *Revelations*, *verſe* the *14th*. he cannot underſtand Chriſtian Religion, and is out of a poſſibility of Salvation. This is a wonderful Diſcovery, and yet one would not think that it came out of a Jeſuits Forge; 'tis wrote ſo bunglingly, 'tis not done with Art enough to deceive, and ſo will not anſwer the Makers purpoſe: For as for us Proteſtants, I hope we are above ſuch little Shams; and we do not only ſay, but we find that Scripture in all Points neceſſary to Salvation is plain and eaſie; ſo that we may run and read: 'Tis true, there are ſome Texts, which we that

are

are unlearned, cannot readily find the true Senſe and meaning of; but they are not ſuch as immediately concern Salvation; and we are not deſtitute of Helps as to theſe; for we have learned and Religious Divines, whom we have all the reaſon imaginable to believe have no other Deſign upon us, than the *Good of Souls*, to whom we may have recourſe; and we always find them willing and ready to afford us their Aſſiſtance: So that to conclude, we are very happy where we are, and in a fair way to underſtand Scripture, tho it may be not every jot and tittle of it. However, I think it much better to know ſome, and ſo much as is ſufficient for my Salvation, than to go over to a Church which would have me ſtupify'd, and to underſtand none at all.

FINIS.

Some Books lately Printed for Brab. Aylmer,

A Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy: to which is added, A Discourse concerning the Unity of the Church. By Dr. *Isaac Barrow*.

A Discourse against Transubstantiation. By Dr. *Tillotson*.

A Discourse concerning the Adoration of the Host, as it is Taught and Practised in the Church of *Rome*.

A Discourse of the Communion in One Kind: In Answer to a Treatise of the Bishop of *Meaux*'s.

A Discourse of the Sacrifice of the Mass, in 4°.

A Discourse against Purgatory.

An Answer to a Book Entituled, Reason and Authority: Or, the Motives of a late Protestant's Reconciliation to the Catholick Church. In a Letter to a Friend. Together with a Brief Account of *Austin* the Monk, and Conversion of the *English*, in 4°.

The Judgment of private Discretion in matters of Religion Defended; in a Sermon on 1 *Thes.* v. 21. Preached at St. *Pauls Covent-Garden*, Feb. 26. 1686. By *Richard Kidder*.

A Request to Roman Catholicks to Answer the Queries upon these their following Tenets: 1. *Their Divine Service in an unknown Tongue.* 2. *Their taking away the Cup from the People.* 3. *Their with-holding the Scriptures from the Laicks.* 4. *The adoration of Images.* 5. *The Invocation of Saints and Angels.* 6. *The Doctrine of Merit.* 7. *Purgatory.* 8. *Their Seven Sacraments.* 9. *Their Priests Intention in Baptism.* 10. *The Limbo of unbaptized Infants.* 11. *Transubstantiation.* 12. *The Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass.* 13. *Private Masses.* 14. *The Sacrament of Penance, &c.*

A Defence of the Ordinations and Ministry of the Church of *England*. In Answer to the Scandals rais'd or reviv'd against them in several late Pamphlets, and particularly in one, Entituled, *The Church of* England *truly Represented*, &c. in 4°. price 9 *d*.

216374